

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

To: GREGORY D. GOROD
GREENHAUS, BRUCE W.
QUALCOMM INCORPORATED
6455 LUSK BOULEVARD
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION

(PCT Rule 66)

Date of Mailing
(day/month/year)

04 MAY 1999

Applicant's or agent's file reference
QCPA392PCT

REPLY DUE
within TWO months
from the above date of mailing

International application No.
PCT/US98/04799

International filing date (day/month/year)
04 MARCH 1998

Priority date (day/month/year)
11 MARCH 1997

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
IPC(6): H04L9/06 and US Cl.: 380/09

Applicant
QUALCOMM INCORPORATION

1. This written opinion is the first (first, etc.) drawn by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.

2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items.

- I ☒ Basis of the opinion
- II ☐ Priority
- III ☐ Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability
- IV ☐ Lack of unity of invention
- V ☒ Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- VI ☐ Certain documents cited
- VII ☐ Certain defects in the international application
- VIII ☐ Certain observations on the international application

3. The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion

When? See the time limit indicated above. The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension; see Rule 66.2(d).

How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

Also For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4. For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4 bis. For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6.

If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.

4. The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 11 JULY 1999

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/JS
Communications of Patents and Trademarks
Box PCT
Washington, D.C. 20231

Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230

Authorized officer

Toby Anderson

Telephone No. (703) 305-1836

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.

PCT/US98/04799

I. Basis of the opinion

This opinion has been drawn on the basis of (Substitute sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed".):

- ☒ the international application as originally filed.
- ☒ the description, pages 1-13, as originally filed.
 pages NONE, filed with the demand.
 pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____
- ☒ the claims, Nos. 1-23, as originally filed.
 Nos. NONE, as amended under Article 19.
 Nos. NONE, filed with the demand.
 Nos. NONE, filed with the letter of _____
- ☒ the drawings, sheets/fig 1-6, as originally filed
 sheets/fig NONE, filed with the demand.
 sheets/fig NONE, filed with the letter of _____

2. The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☒ the description, pages NONE
- ☒ the claims, Nos. NONE
- ☒ the drawings, sheets/fig NONE

3. ☐ This opinion has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box. Additional observations below (Rule 70.2(c)).

4. Additional observations, if necessary:

NONE

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.

PCT/US98/04799

V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability, citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. STATEMENT

Novelty (N)	Claims 1-20	YES
	Claims 21-23	NO
Inventive Step (IS)	Claims NONE	YES
	Claims 1-23	NO
Industrial Applicability (IA)	Claims 1-23	YES
	Claims NONE	NO

2. CITATIONS AND EXPLANATIONS

Claims 1-20 meet the novelty requirement in that a single reference does not teach or fairly suggest the claimed invention.

Claims 21-23 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Alanaset US Patent No. 5,594,797

Claims 21-23 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Reeds, US Patent No. 5,159,634.

Claims 21 and 22 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Shimada, US Patent No. 5,687,238.

Claims 1-23 lack inventive step under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Alanaset, US Patent No. 5,594,797 in view of Shimada, US Patent No. 5,687,238. Alanaset teaches a method of transforming a set of message signals comprising a first encryption step, a self inverting encryption step, and a reverse encryption step. Alanaset also discloses all limitations in claims 2-23. Alanaset does not explicitly teach a second encryption step and a second reverse encryption step. Shimada discloses these steps.

Claims 1-23 meet the Industrial Applicability requirement in that a method of transforming a set of message signals is a useful and applicable invention for data security.

----- NEW CITATIONS -----

US 5,687,238 A (SHIMADA, Michio) 11 NOV 1997, see: abstract, column 1, lines 39-59

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.

PCT/US98/04799

Supplemental Box

(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

Continuation of: Boxes I - VIII

Sheet 10

TIME LIMIT:

The time limit set for response to a Written Opinion may not be extended. 37 CFR 1.484(d). Any response received after the expiration of the time limit set in the Written Opinion will not be considered in preparing the International Preliminary Examination Report.